

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 27 2006

Docket No. 031794-3

Serial No. 10/663,977

Page 5

REMARKS

The Office Action of September 27, 2006 was received and reviewed. The Examiner is thanked for reviewing the application.

Claims 4-9 were pending prior to the instant amendment for consideration. By this amendment, claim 4 has been amended to recite additional features to which Applicants are entitled. Accordingly, claims 4-9 are pending for consideration, of which claim 4 is independent.

Referring now to the detailed Office Action, claims 4-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,845,454 – hereafter Kim). Further, claims 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA and Kim in view of Dehghan (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,087 – hereafter Dehghan).

In rejecting independent claim 4, the Examiner states that the AAPA substantially discloses the claimed invention except for disabling a master oscillator when in a low power mode. The Examiner relies upon Kim to overcome the deficiencies of the AAPA. However, independent claim 4 has been amended to more positively claim the present invention and now recites, *inter alia*, the features of “a process control portion which generates a clock-control signal which alternately changes between clock-enable and clock-disable states each time the detection signal is supplied thereto, and stops the operation of both the oscillation circuit and the transmission function portion while the clock-control signal is in the disable-state.” Clearly, the combination of the AAPA in view of Kim does not teach or suggest the features of a process control portion which generates a clock-control signal which alternately changes between clock-enable and clock-disable states each time the detection signal is supplied thereto, and stops the operation of both the oscillation circuit and the transmission function portion while the clock-control signal is in the disable-state as presently claimed.

The Examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any prima facie conclusion of obviousness. *MPEP* §2142. To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, to modify the references or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art must teach all the claim limitations. *MPEP* §2142.

Applicants respectfully point to the final prong of the test, which states the prior art

10232751.1

Docket No. 031794-3
Serial No. 10/663,977
Page 6

must teach all the claim limitations. At the very least, the combination of AAPA and Kim does not teach all of the claim limitations of independent claim 4 for the reasons set forth above.


In light of the foregoing arguments, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Kim is respectfully requested.

The secondary reference of Dehghan does not cure the deficiencies of AAPA and Kim mentioned above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 4 is allowable as discussed previously. Further, any claim that depends from an allowable claim is allowable as well. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the various rejections of dependent claims 5-9 likewise be removed.

In light of the foregoing arguments, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA and Kim in view of Dehghan is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that claims 4-9 be allowed, and that the application be passed to issue. If a conference would expedite prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,


Donald R. Studebaker
Registration No. 32,815

NIXON PEABODY LLP
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000

10232751.1